

Type Ia Supernovae and Remnant Neutron Stars

A. R. King^{1,2}, J.E. Pringle², D.T. Wickramasinghe^{2,3}

¹ *Astronomy Group, University of Leicester, Leicester, LE1 7RH*

² *Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Rd, Cambridge CB3 0HA*

³ *Astrophysical Theory Centre, Australian National University, ACT 0200, Australia*

Accepted. Received

ABSTRACT

On the basis of the current observational evidence, we put forward the case that the merger of two CO white dwarfs produces both a Type Ia supernova explosion and a stellar remnant, the latter in the form of a magnetar. The estimated occurrence rates raise the possibility that many, if not most, SNe Ia might result from white dwarf mergers.

Key words: supernovae: general – stars: white dwarfs, neutron, pulsars, magnetic fields

1 INTRODUCTION

Type Ia supernovae are currently being used as empirical standard candles in the redshift range $z = 0.1 - 1$ to provide evidence that the expansion of the Universe might be accelerating (Riess et al., 1998; Perlmutter et al., 1998, 1999). This has naturally renewed interest in what they might be. The case for cosmological acceleration depends critically on the degree to which Type Ia supernovae can be treated as standard candles, independent of redshift. Only a good understanding of the nature and the origin of these supernovae can provide confidence that they actually are standard candles.

The most favoured scenario (see, for example, Livio 2000) for the SN Ia event is the explosion and complete disintegration of a CO white dwarf, brought about by the accretion of material which pushes the mass of the white dwarf over the Chandrasekhar limiting mass $M_{\text{Ch}} = 1.44M_{\odot}$. The resulting rapid conversion of about a solar mass of C/O to Ni^{56} , and the subsequent decay of Ni^{56} to Fe^{56} , provides the right amount of energy to power the observed explosion, and releases it on the right timescale to explain the observed light-curve. It can also account for the lack of hydrogen observed in these supernovae.

While this picture is largely agreed, the main debate concerns the nature of the precursor driving the accretion which pushes the white dwarf mass over the limit. Here the favoured view envisages two main possibilities.

The first possibility is that the precursor is a binary system containing a white dwarf accreting hydrogen from a non-degenerate star (the single-degenerate scenario). This possibility suffers from two main drawbacks. First, the accretion of hydrogen on to a white dwarf can lead to ordinary nova explosions, which over time tend to decrease, rather than increase, the mass of the white dwarf; and sec-

ond, it is difficult, though not perhaps impossible, to set off a supernova explosion right next to a large mass of hydrogen (the non-degenerate companion) without the supernova ejecta becoming contaminated by the hydrogen from the companion's envelope (Marietta, Fryxell & Burrows, 2000).

The second possibility is the merger of two white dwarfs (the double-degenerate scenario). The white dwarfs are brought together by gravitational radiation on a timescale t_{grav} , until the less massive, and thus the less dense, fills its Roche lobe and begins to transfer mass. The initial timescale for mass transfer is set by gravitational radiation, and for these systems is of order 10^6 years. Many authors (Saio & Nomoto, 1985, 1998; Kawai, Saio & Nomoto, 1987; Mochkovitch & Livio, 1990; Timmes, Woosley & Taam, 1994; Mochkovitch, Guerrero & Segretain, 1997) contend that under such circumstances no explosion takes place, and the result is a quiet, accretion-induced collapse (AIC), forming a neutron star remnant.

In this paper we argue that there is strong observational evidence that the merger of two CO white dwarfs produces *both* a supernova explosion *and* a stellar remnant; and further, that since such a supernova does not involve hydrogen it must be of Type I, and probably of Type Ia. Thus at least some, if not all, SNe Ia result from the merging of two white dwarfs. In Section 2, we consider the outcome of the merger if the total mass of the two white dwarfs is less than M_{Ch} , and identify the likely merger products as massive and highly magnetic white dwarfs. In Section 3 we consider the case where the combined mass exceeds M_{Ch} , and by analogy identify the likely merger products as the magnetars. We summarize our conclusions in Section 4.

2 MERGER PRODUCTS

Since the outcome of a CO white dwarf merger is difficult to predict theoretically, we start from a case where the answer is clear, namely when the total binary mass M is slightly smaller than M_{Ch} . A supernova is unlikely (but see Section 3 below), so there must be a remnant – a massive white dwarf. Indeed Livio, Pringle & Saffer (1992) suggested that a significant fraction of massive white dwarfs are the result of mergers. Furthermore the white dwarf is spun up to rapid rotation by accretion from a disc, and is likely to be highly magnetic because of the winding up of magnetic fields in this disc. Statistical evidence supports this picture. It is now well established that the mass distribution of isolated white dwarfs has, in addition to the dominant peak at $0.57 M_{\odot}$, a second peak near $1.2 M_{\odot}$ with a tail which extends up to M_{Ch} . Wickramasinghe & Ferrario (2000) show that a large proportion (about 25 per cent) of the white dwarfs in this high mass group are strongly magnetic, while for the white dwarf sample as a whole, only 5 per cent are magnetic. However it is unlikely that *all* high mass magnetic white dwarfs result from mergers, since some rotate very slowly (periods > 100 yr). These must arise from single star evolution (see Wickramasinghe and Ferrario 2000).

We should next ask for a specific example of such a merger remnant. The best studied massive magnetic white dwarf is RE J0317–853, which has mass $M_{\text{WD}} = 1.35 M_{\odot}$, magnetic field B_0 in the range $3.5 \times 10^8 - 8 \times 10^8$ G, and spin period $P_0 = 725$ s (see Wickramasinghe & Ferrario 2000 and references therein). This looks remarkably like a white dwarf merger product which missed M_{Ch} by a narrow margin. However before accepting this important conclusion we should examine other possibilities.

2.1 Single-star evolution

RE J0317–853 could in principle have formed in the normal course of single-star evolution as the degenerate core of a giant. Its mass $M_{\text{WD}} \lesssim M_{\text{Ch}}$ implies that the latter star must have had a mass close to the maximum that will give a white dwarf rather than a neutron star or black hole, i.e. about $8 M_{\odot}$. Livio & Pringle (1998) argue that dynamo-generated magnetic fields at the core–envelope interface will make the core of such a star rotate with angular velocity $\Omega_c \simeq 6.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at the end of the giant phase. The inner $1.35 M_{\odot}$ of this core has radius $0.2 R_{\odot}$: collapsing this to the likely radius $R_0 \sim 3 \times 10^8$ cm of RE J0317–853 and assuming angular momentum conservation produces a spin period of about 4×10^7 s. This is probably an underestimate, as the white dwarf magnetic field implied by Livio & Pringle’s calculations is much smaller than the observed $B_0 = 3.5 - 8 \times 10^8$ G: the core field at the end of the giant phase is $B_c \simeq 2 \times 10^{-2}$ G, and flux conservation increases this only to ~ 50 G for the white dwarf. Spruit & Phinney (1998) predict somewhat longer white dwarf spin periods $\sim 10^8$ s, as in their calculations the degenerate core is close to corotation with the giant envelope. We conclude that RE J0317–853’s observed spin period $P_0 = 725$ s cannot be explained if it is the result of single-star evolution. Further, this evolution offers no obvious reason why the observed magnetic field should be so strong.

2.2 Binary evolution

Descent from an interacting binary offers a clear avenue for explaining the rapid spin of RE J0317–853.

(a) *Conventional CV evolution.*

The most straightforward idea is that RE J0317–853 might represent some endpoint of cataclysmic variable (CV) evolution, in which a white dwarf accretes from a low-mass companion. RE J0317–853’s strong field would make it an extreme member of the AM Herculis subgroup (in fact its field is stronger than any known member of this class). In the conventional picture of AM Herculis evolution, the strong field of the white dwarf keeps the spin of this star locked to the orbital motion. RE J0317–853 cannot descend from this evolution, as the minimum orbital period for any CV is about 80 minutes, far above the observed $P_0 = 725$ s.

(b) *Unusual CV evolution*

In a recent paper, Meyer & Meyer–Hofmeister (1999) argue that AM Her systems may lose synchronism at very short orbital periods, when the secondary becomes so cool that the conductivity of its envelope drops catastrophically. In this case the white dwarf could indeed spin up to much shorter periods, and the companion star would be disrupted on a short timescale as the binary separation shrinks because of the draining of orbital angular momentum to the white dwarf spin. At first sight this looks like an attractive idea for explaining the properties of RE J0317–853. However since the deeper layers of the companion must remain ionized, we would expect this star to retain a strong enough dipole moment to remain synchronous. Even leaving this aside, this idea offers no explanations for the unusually high mass and magnetic field of RE J0317–853.

We conclude that RE J0317–853 is not likely to be explained as an end-product of these other types of evolution. On the other hand, as we suggested above, it arises quite naturally as the result of a CO white dwarf merger, with at least one of the white dwarfs being mildly magnetic. A variant of this idea is to invoke coalescence of such a CO white dwarf with the fairly massive core of a giant companion through common-envelope evolution. For many purposes these two possibilities are extremely similar.

3 WHAT IF $M > M_{\text{Ch}}$?

We concluded above that the massive white dwarf RE J0317–853 is the result of a white dwarf merger with M slightly less than M_{Ch} . We can now ask what end-product would have emerged had M been slightly larger than M_{Ch} , and the resulting collapse had left a remnant rather than provoking complete disruption.

We first consider the merger process in a little more detail. If the mass ratio q is less than 0.63 mass transfer is stable, and continues at a rate governed by gravitational radiation. However, if $q > 0.63$, mass transfer is dynamically unstable. Mass is then transferred rapidly until $q < 0.63$. Stability is achieved on a timescale of $\tau \sim t_{\text{grav}}^{2/3} P^{1/3}$, where P is the orbital period and t_{grav} is the timescale specifying the rate at which transfer begins. Typically we expect $t_{\text{grav}} \sim 10^6$ yr, $P \sim$ a few hours, and thus τ to be of order a few hundred years. However, the mass transfer rate for an $n = 3/2$ polytrope obeys $\dot{M}/M \sim P^{1/2}(t_0 - t)^{-3/2}$, valid for time

t less than some reference time t_0 , (Webbink 1985), so the bulk of the mass transfer before stability is achieved occurs on a timescale of several orbital periods. Once stability is achieved, transfer slows once more towards the rate governed by gravitational radiation.

Because no existing computation has been able to consider accretion of He or of C/O on to a white dwarf at such high rates, there is still considerable uncertainty as to what the final outcome might be. For example, Regős et al (2000) argue, from population synthesis models, that the majority of SNe Ia are caused by rapid accretion of He on to a sub-Chandrasekhar-mass white dwarf and a subsequent edge-lit detonation of carbon, leading to the complete thermonuclear disintegration of the white dwarf. In contrast, as we remarked above, many authors contend that such edge-lit ignition can lead to quiet burning of the CO to O/Ne/Mg, and thus speculatively to a quiet accretion induced collapse (at least for $M = M_{\text{Ch}}$) to form a neutron star but with no supernova explosion and thus with no supernova remnant. While the computations have yet to be carried out, it seems to us hard to escape the conclusion that if the Chandrasekhar limit is exceeded during the mass transfer, collapse to neutron star densities must ensue.

If, during such a collapse, we assume conservation of angular momentum and magnetic flux as the stellar radius shrinks from the $R_0 \simeq 3 \times 10^8$ cm of RE J0317-853 to the $R = 10^6$ cm of a neutron star, we find a spin period $P = P_0(R/R_0)^2 = 7$ ms and a field $B = B_0(R_0/R)^2 = 3.5 - 8 \times 10^{13}$ G. We draw attention to the fact that these values are remarkably close to those required in the magnetar model now thought to provide an explanation of the properties of soft gamma repeaters (SGRs) and the related anomalous X-ray pulsars (AXPs) (see Thompson, 1999, and Kouveliotou, 1999 for recent reviews). Moreover, we might expect even more extreme values of these two parameters for two reasons. First, the strongly increased shearing resulting from a collapse to much smaller dimensions is likely to increase the strength of the magnetic field considerably (Thompson & Duncan, 1995; Kluzniak & Ruderman, 1998). Second, with a surface temperature of $\sim 4 \times 10^4$ K, RE J0317-853's spin period at birth could have been considerably shorter than the current 725 s, as even tiny amounts of mass loss coupling to its large magnetic moment would have caused spindown within its cooling age of several 10^7 yr.

More extreme fields and rotation rates put us squarely in the parameter space ($P = \text{few ms}$, $B \gtrsim 10^{14}$ G) inferred for magnetars at birth. We conclude that the probable outcome of a magnetic white dwarf merger with $M > M_{\text{Ch}}$ is a magnetar.

4 DISCUSSION

We have argued that the merger of two CO white dwarfs results in a remnant which is both rapidly rotating and highly magnetic. If the total mass is less than M_{Ch} , the remnant is a massive, magnetic white dwarf. And if the total mass exceeds M_{Ch} , the remnant is a rapidly rotating, strongly magnetic neutron star. We have identified such remnants as magnetars.

This conclusion leads to another. Soft gamma ray re-

peaters (and anomalous X-ray pulsars) are associated with supernova remnants (see, for example, the discussion in Kouveliotou, 1999). This implies that the collapse caused by the merger is not a quiescent 'accretion induced collapse', but actually gives rise to a supernova explosion. If our identification of magnetars as CO-CO white dwarf merger products is correct, then the supernovae associated with them should have high-velocity carbon and higher-mass elements (from the disrupted remnant disc), but no hydrogen or helium. We conclude, therefore, that CO-CO white dwarf mergers produce both a Type I supernova and a neutron star remnant, and, further, that if one of the merging white dwarfs has a significant magnetic field (estimated at around 25 per cent of the total), then this neutron star is a magnetar.

We may use this now to estimate an occurrence rate for these supernovae. SGRs and AXPs are known to have rather short lifetimes $\sim 10^4$ yr, (cf Kouveliotou, 1999; Thompson, 1999), from arguments based on the observed spindown timescale $|P/\dot{P}|$, and the typical age of the associated supernova remnants. The magnetar model gives similar (or even shorter) spindown ages. From the current observed total number of SGRs and AXPs (~ 10), this characteristic age implies an estimate for the formation rate of magnetars of $\sim 10^{-3}$ yr $^{-1}$ in the Galaxy.

We now ask: what kind of Type I supernovae do the CO-CO-mergers correspond to? We note first that the inferred SNe Ia rate for the Galaxy is approximately $\sim 10^{-3}$ yr $^{-1}$ (Yungelson & Livio 2000). Thus the estimated occurrence rates provide no obvious grounds for rejecting the possibility that *most* SNe Ia might result from white dwarf mergers. Moreover they cannot be of Type Ib, which are associated with high-mass stars, and, if the above estimates are correct, they are too numerous to be of Type Ic (Cappellaro et al., 1997 show that the combined rate for Types Ib and Ic is lower than for Type Ia).

The white dwarf merger scenario is currently perhaps the less favoured option for SNe Ia, but there are not yet adequate grounds to rule it out. While the weight of opinion appears to be that the merger of two white dwarfs leads to accretion-induced collapse, and no supernova explosion or remnant, the computations required to provide verification have yet to be carried out. Moreover, Regős et al (2000), on the basis of population synthesis calculations, conclude that most SNe Ia result from edge-lit detonations in merging white dwarfs with $M < M_{\text{Ch}}$. Here we have argued that merging white dwarfs with $M > M_{\text{Ch}}$ might also give rise to SNe Ia. In both cases, the homogeneity of the initial conditions, and the available energy supply, point to uniformity of outcome which is characteristic of SNe Ia. And in neither case have the necessary computations been performed to determine what that outcome might be.

5 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Carole Haswell, Chryssa Kouveliotou, Chris Thompson and Chris Tout for helpful conversations, and David Branch for a helpful referee's report. ARK gratefully acknowledges a PPARC Senior Fellowship, and he and DTW thank the Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge, for hospitality.

REFERENCES

- Cappellaro, E., Turatto, M., Tsvetkov, D. Yu., Bartunov, O. S., Pollas, C., Evans, R., Hamuy, M., 1997, *A&A*, 322, 431
- Kawai, Y., Saio, H., Nomoto, K., 1987, *ApJ*, 315, 229
- Kouveliotou, C., 1999, *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 96, 5351
- Kluźniak, W., Ruderman, M., *ApJ* 505, L113, 1998
- Livio, M., 2000, in *The Greatest Explosions since the Big Bang: Supernovae and Gamma-Ray Bursts*, Space Telescope Science Institute, in press
- Livio, M., Pringle, J.E., 1998, *ApJ* 505, 339
- Livio, M., Pringle, J.E., Saffer, R.A., 1992, *MNRAS*, 257, 15P
- Meyer, F., Meyer-Hofmeister, E., 1999, *New Astronomy Reviews*, 44, 161
- Mochkovitch, R., Guerrero, J., Segretain, L., 1997, in *Thermonuclear Supernovae* (Ruiz-Lapuente, R., Canal, R., Isern, J. eds.) Kluwer, p. 187
- Mochkovitch, R., Livio, M., 1990, *A&A* 236, 378
- Perlmutter et al., 1998, *Nat*, 391, 51
- Perlmutter et al., 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 565
- Regős, E., Tout, C.A., Wickramasinghe, D.T., Hurley, J., Pols, O.M., 2000, *ApJ*, submitted
- Riess et al., 1998, *AJ*, 116, 1009
- Saio, H., Nomoto, K., 1985, *A&A*, 150, L21
- Saio, H., Nomoto, K., 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 388
- Spruit, H., Phinney, E.S., 1998, *Nat.* 393, 139
- Timmer, F.X., Woosley, S.E., Taam, R.E., 1994, *ApJ* 420, 348
- Thompson, C., Duncan, R.C., 1995, in *Millisecond Pulsars: a Decade of Surprise*; ASP Conference Series, Volume 72, Fruchter, A.S., Tavani, M., Backer, D.C. eds. Astronomical Society of the Pacific, p.301
- Thompson, C., 1999, in *Pulsar Astronomy - 2000 and Beyond*, ASP Conference Series, Vol. 202; *Proc IAU Colloq* 177 Kramer, M., Wex, N., Wielebinski, N. eds. Astronomical Society of the Pacific, p. 669
- Yungelson, L., Livio, M., 2000, *ApJ*, 528, 108
- Webbink, R.F., 1985, in *Interacting Binary Stars*, eds Pringle, J.E., Wade, R.A., CUP, p.39
- Wickramasinghe, D.T., Ferrario, L., 2000, *PASP*, 112, 873